

[HOME](#) | [CANCEL](#) | [HELP](#)**FCC Form 470**

Universal Service Program Description of Services Requested and Certification Form

**Entity Number: 145710****Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN
Bandwidth****Contact Person: Martin Visnak****Phone Number: (303) 982-6500**

**Please Record This Form 470 Application Number For Future Reference:
This Number Must Be Used To Complete Your Application,
If You Leave This Process Before The Application Is Completed.**

Form 470 Application#: 533080001262689[Next >>](#)

[HOME](#) | [CANCEL](#) | [SAVE & EXIT](#) | [HELP](#)

FCC Form 470

Universal Service Program Description of Services Requested and Certification Form

Approval by OMB
3060-0806**Entity Number: 145710****Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN
Bandwidth****Contact Person: Martin Visnak****Phone Number: (303) 982-6500**

Please choose one of the following options to continue certification:

Form 470 Application#: **533080001262689**

This is the final step in completing your Form 470. You may sign this document either electronically through the use of a PIN, or you may print out a certification page, sign it, and then mail it to the address listed below.

For Electronic Certification, click the Electronic Certification button and you will view the electronic certification screen of Block 5. On this page you will enter your User ID and your PIN. If you do not have a PIN, you must certify this form on paper, and USAC will then send you a PIN for future use.

[Electronic Certification](#)

Paper Certification - After clicking the "Paper Certification" button, you will view the final screen of Block 5.

- (1) Use Paper Certification ONLY if you are not Electronically Certifying your 470.
- (2) **Print out (using your browser), sign, and send in this Block 5 certification page.** When you print Block 5 using your browser, the form will automatically include your Form 470 Application Number, Applicant Name, and Applicant Address. Item (25) must be signed by the person who will certify to the accuracy of the information on the form. Mail the signed Block 5 to:

SLD - Form 470
P.O.Box 7026
Lawrence, KS 66044-7026

If sent by express delivery services or U.S. Postal Service, Return Receipt Requested, the form should be mailed to:

SLD Forms
ATTN: SLD Form 470
3833 Greenway Drive
Lawrence, KS 66046

[Paper Certification](#)

Note: If you need to print a Paper Certification and are not currently connected to a printer, you can

Exhibit 5

close out and come back later using Certify Complete from the Main Menu.

To Return to the Main Menu of this site, click the "Main Menu" button.

[Main Menu](#)

FCC Form 470

Universal Service Program Description of Services Requested and Certification Form



Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth

Entity Number: 145710

Contact Person:

Phone Number: 0 -

FCC Form

Approval by OMB
3060-0806

Do not write in this area

470

**Schools and Libraries Universal Service
Program Description of Services Requested
and Certification Form**

FCC Form 470 Application Number: 533080001262689

<p>16. I certify that the applicant includes: (Check one or both.)</p> <p>a. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> schools under the statutory definitions of elementary and secondary schools found in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. §§ 7801 (18) and (38), that do not operate as for-profit businesses, and do not have endowments exceeding \$50 million; and/or</p> <p>b. <input type="checkbox"/> libraries or library consortia eligible for assistance from a State library administrative agency under the Library Services and Technology Act of 1996 that do not operate as for-profit businesses and whose budgets are completely separate from any schools (including, but not limited to elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities).</p>

17. [Reserved]

18. ☒ I certify that I will post any applicable FCC Form 470 and (if applicable) make any applicable RFP available for at least 28 days before considering all bids received and selecting a service provider. I certify that all bids submitted will be carefully considered and the bid selected will be for the most cost-effective service or equipment offering, with price being the primary factor, and will be the most cost-effective means of meeting educational needs and technology goals.

19. ☒ I certify that I will retain required documents for a period of at least 10 years after the last day of service delivered (or whatever retention period is required by the rules in effect at the time of this certification). I certify that I will retain all documents necessary to demonstrate compliance with the statute and Commission rules regarding the form for, receipt of, and delivery of services receiving schools and libraries discounts. I acknowledge that I may be audited pursuant to participation in the schools and libraries program.

20. ☒ I certify that the services the applicant purchases at discounts provided by 47 U.S.C. § 254 will be used primarily for educational purposes, see 47 C.F.R. § 54.500, and will not be sold, resold or transferred in consideration for money or any other thing of value, except as permitted by the Commission's rules at 47 C.F.R. § 54.513. Additionally, I certify that the entity or entities listed on this form have not received anything of value or a promise of anything of value, other than services and equipment sought by means of this form, from the service provider, or any representative or agent thereof or any consultant in connection with this request for services.

21. ☒ I acknowledge that support under this support mechanism is conditional upon the school(s) and/or library(ies) I represent securing access, separately or through this program, to all of the resources, including computers, training, software, internal connections, maintenance, and electrical capacity necessary to use the services purchased effectively. I recognize that some of the

Exhibit 5

aforementioned resources are not eligible for support. I certify that I have considered what financial resources should be available to cover these costs.

22. ☒ I certify that I am authorized to procure eligible services for the eligible entity(ies). I certify that I am authorized to submit this request on behalf of the eligible entity(ies) listed on this form, that I have examined this request, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, all statements of fact contained herein are true.

23. ☒ I certify that I have reviewed all applicable FCC, state, and local procurement/competitive bidding requirements and that I have complied with them. I acknowledge that persons willfully making false statements on this form may be punished by fine or forfeiture, under the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 502, 503(b), or fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

24. ☒ I acknowledge that FCC rules provide that persons who have been convicted of criminal violations or held civilly liable for certain acts arising from their participation in the schools and libraries support mechanism are subject to suspension and debarment from the program.

25. Cert ID = 1503137	26. Date 12/3/2014
27a. Printed name of authorized person Brett Miller	
27b. Title or position of authorized person Chief Information Officer	
<input type="checkbox"/> Check here if the consultant in Item 7 is the Authorized Person.	
27c. Street Address, P.O. Box, Route Number, City, State, Zip Code 1829 Denver West Drive Bldg # 27 City Golden State CO	
Zip Code 80401	
27d. Telephone number of Authorized Person: (303) 982-2265	
27e. Fax Number of Authorized Person: (303) 982-6851	
27f. E-mail Address of Authorized Person: bmillar@jeffco.k12.co.us	
Re-enter E-mail Address	
27g. Name of Authorized Person's Employer: Jefferson County Public Schools	
ATTENTION: If you are signing FCC Form 470 using the PIN assigned to you by SLD, you are reminded that using the PIN is equivalent to your handwritten signature on the form. Your use of the PIN to affirm these certifications means that should they prove untrue, you will be held to the same enforcement standards as those who affirm the certifications on paper. Also, by using the PIN, you are affirming that you have the authority to make these certifications and represent the entity featured in Block One of this funding request.	
Please Check to affirm your compliance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

FCC Form 470 Application Number:

Jefferson County School District R-1
1829 Denver West Drive, Building 27
Golden, CO 80401-0000

Exhibit 5

Service provider involvement with preparation or certification of an FCC Form 470 can taint the competitive bidding process and result in the denial of funding requests. For more information, refer to the Schools and Libraries area of the USAC web site at www.usac.org/sl or call the SLD Client Service Bureau at 1-888-203-8100.

NOTICE: In accordance with Section 54.504 of the Federal Communications Commission's rules, certain schools and libraries ordering services that are eligible for and seeking universal service discounts must file this Description of Services Requested and Certification Form (FCC Form 470) with the Universal Service Administrator. 47 C.F.R. § 54.503(c). The collection of information stems from the Commission's authority under Section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. 47 U.S.C. § 254. The data in the report will be used to ensure that schools and libraries comply with the competitive bidding requirement contained in 47 C.F.R. § 54.503. Schools and libraries must file this form themselves or as part of a consortium.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The FCC is authorized under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to collect the information we request in this form. We will use the information you provide to determine whether approving this application is in the public interest. If we believe there may be a violation or a potential violation of any applicable statute, regulation, rule or order, your application may be referred to the Federal, state, or local agency responsible for investigating, prosecuting, enforcing, or implementing the statute, rule, regulation or order. In certain cases, the information in your application may be disclosed to the Department of Justice or a court or adjudicative body when (a) the FCC; or (b) any employee of the FCC; or (c) the United States Government is a party of a proceeding before the body or has an interest in the proceeding. In addition, information provided in or submitted with this form or in response to subsequent inquiries may also be subject to disclosure consistent with the Communications Act of 1934, FCC regulations, the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, or other applicable law.

If you owe a past due debt to the federal government, the information you provide may also be disclosed to the Department of the Treasury Financial Management Service, other Federal agencies and/or your employer to offset your salary, IRS tax refund or other payments to collect that debt. The FCC may also provide the information to these agencies through the matching of computer records when authorized.

If you do not provide the information we request on the form, the FCC may delay processing of your application or may return your form without action.

The foregoing Notice is required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. § 3501, *et seq.*

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, completing, and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the reporting burden to the Federal Communications Commission, Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Washington, DC 20554.

Done

1997 - 2014 © , Universal Service Administrative Company, All Rights Reserved

FCC Form 470

Approval by OMB
3060-0806

Schools and Libraries Universal Service Description of Services Requested and Certification Form 470

Estimated Average Burden Hours per Response: 3 hours

This form is designed to help you describe the eligible services you seek so that this data can be posted on the Fund Administrator Internet Site and interested service providers can identify you as a potential customer and compete to serve you.

Please read instructions before beginning this form.

Form 470 Application Number: 533080001262689	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Application Status: INCOMPLETE	Posting Date:
Allowable Contract Date:	Certification Received Date:

Block 1: Applicant Address and Information

1 Name of Applicant:

Jefferson County School District R-1

2 Funding Year: 2015 (Funding years run from July 1 through the following June 30)

3 Entity Number: 145710

4a Street Address, P.O.Box, or Route Number:

1829 Denver West Drive, Building 27

City: Golden State: CO Zip Code: 80401 -0000

4b Telephone Number: (303) 982 -6500

4c Fax Number: (303) 982 -6943

5a Eligible Entities That Will Receive Services:

Check the ONE choice in 5a that best describes the eligible entities that will receive the services described in this form. You will then list in Item 15 the entity/entities that will pay the bills for these services.

- ☐ Individual School (individual public or non-public school)
- ☒ School District (LEA; public or non-public [e.g., diocesan] local district representing multiple schools)
- ☐ Library (including library system, library outlet/branch or library consortium as defined under LSTA)
- ☐ Consortium (intermediate service agencies, states, state networks, consortia of schools and/or libraries)
- ☐ Statewide application for (enter 2-letter state code)
- representing (check all that apply)
- ☐ All public schools/districts in the state
- ☐ All non-public schools in the state
- ☐ All libraries in the state

5b Recipient(s) of Services - Check all that apply:

- ☐ Private ☒ Public ☐ Charter
- ☐ Tribal ☐ Head Start ☐ State Agency

5c Number of eligible entities for which services are sought: 154

Block 1: Applicant Address and Information (continued)

6a Contact Person's Name:

Martin Visnak

If the Contact Person's Street Address is the same as Item 4a above, check here. ☐ If not, complete Item 6b.

6b Street Address, P.O.Box, or Route Number:

NOTE: USAC will use this address to mail correspondence

1829 Denver West Drive, Building 27

City: Golden State: CO Zip Code: 80401 -0000

Check the box next to your preferred mode of contact and provide your contact information. One box MUST be checked and an entry provided.

☐ 6c Telephone Number: (303) 982 -6500☐ 6d Fax Number: (303) 982 -6851☒ 6e E-Mail Address: mvisnak@jeffco.k12.co.us

Re-enter E-mail Address: mvisnak@jeffco.k12.co.us

If a consultant is assisting you with your application process, please complete Item 7 below:

7 Consultant Name:

Name of Consultant's Employer:

Consultant's Street Address:

City: State: Zip Code:

Consultant's Telephone Number: Ext.

Consultant's Fax Number:

Consultant's E-mail Address:

Re-enter E-mail Address:

Consultant Registration Number:

Exhibit 5

Utility Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth								
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Phone Number: (303) 982-6500								
Block 2: Summary Description of Needs or Services Requested									
Category One: Internet Access and/or Telecommunications									
If you check YES to indicate you have a Request for Proposals (RFP) that specifies the services you are seeking, your RFP must be available to all interested bidders for at least 28 days. If your RFP is not available to all interested bidders, or if you check NO and you have or intend to have an RFP, you risk denial of your funding requests.									
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES, I have released or intend to release an RFP for one or more of these services. It is available or will become available on the Internet URL: http://www.govbids.com/scripts/col1/public/home1.asp?utm_medium=referral&utm_source=JEF46CO&utm_campaign=web_site or via (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person in Item 6 or <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person listed in Item 12 Your RFP Identifier: Jeffco Schoos RFP #23612									
<input type="checkbox"/> NO, I have not released and do not intend to release an RFP for any of these services.									
Whether you check YES or NO, you must list below the Internet access and/or telecommunications you seek. Specify each service or function (e.g., voice service, monthly Internet access service, etc) and quantity and/or capacity (e.g., for voice service, 20 existing lines plus 10 new ones, or for monthly Internet access service, for 500 users).									
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Service</th><th>Quantity and/or Capacity</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>100 Mbps Circuit</td><td>129</td></tr><tr><td>1 Gbps Circuit</td><td>23</td></tr><tr><td>10 Gbps Circuit</td><td>2</td></tr></tbody></table>	Service	Quantity and/or Capacity	100 Mbps Circuit	129	1 Gbps Circuit	23	10 Gbps Circuit	2	
Service	Quantity and/or Capacity								
100 Mbps Circuit	129								
1 Gbps Circuit	23								
10 Gbps Circuit	2								
[Reserved]									

Exhibit 5

Utility Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Phone Number: (303) 982-6500
Category Two: Internal Connections and Managed Internal Broadband Services	
If you check YES to indicate you have a Request for Proposals (RFP) that specifies the services you are seeking, your RFP must be available to all interested bidders for at least 28 days. If your RFP is not available to all interested bidders, or if you check NO and you have or intend to have an RFP, you risk denial of your funding requests.	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES, I have released or intend to release an RFP for one or more of these services. It is available or will become available on the Internet at: or via (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person in Item 6 or <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person listed in Item 12 Your RFP Identifier:	
<input type="checkbox"/> NO, I have not released and do not intend to release an RFP for any of these services.	
Whether you check YES or NO, you must list below the Internal Connections and Managed Internal Broadband Services you seek. Specify each service (e.g., a router, hub and cabling) and quantity and/or capacity (e.g., connecting 1 classroom of 30 students).	
<hr/>	
Category Two: Basic Maintenance of Internal Connections	
If you check YES to indicate you have a Request for Proposals (RFP) that specifies the services you are seeking, your RFP must be available to all interested bidders for at least 28 days. If your RFP is not available to all interested bidders, or if you check NO and you have or intend to have an RFP, you risk denial of your funding requests.	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES, I have released or intend to release an RFP for these services. It is available or will become available on the Internet at: or via (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person in Item 6 or <input type="checkbox"/> the contact person listed in Item 12 Your RFP Identifier:	
<input type="checkbox"/> NO, I have not released and do not intend to release an RFP for these services.	
Whether you check YES or NO, you must list below the Basic Maintenance services you seek. Specify each service (e.g., basic maintenance of routers) and quantity and/or capacity (e.g., for 10 routers).	
<hr/>	

Entity Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Phone Number: (303) 982-6500

12 (Optional) Please name the person on your staff or project who can provide additional technical details or answer specific questions from service providers about the services you are seeking. This person does not need to be the contact person(s) listed in Item 6 nor the Authorized Person who signs this form.

Name:
Holly Callero Penny

Title:
Purchasing Manager

Telephone Number: (303) 982 - 6756

Fax Number: (303) 982 - 6287

Email Address: hpenny@jeffco.k12.co.us

Re-enter E-mail Address: hpenny@jeffco.k12.co.us

13 ☒ Check this box if there are any restrictions imposed by state or local laws or regulations on how or when service providers may contact you or on other bidding procedures. Please describe below any such restrictions or procedures and/or provide an Internet address where they are posted and a contact name and telephone number.

☐ Check this box if no state and local procurement/competitive bidding requirements apply to the procurement of services sought on this FCC Form 470. If you are requesting services for a funding year for which an FCC Form 470 cannot yet be filed online, include that information here.

http://www.govbids.com/scripts/co1/public/home1.asp?utm_medium=referral&utm_source=JEF46CO&utm_campaign=web_site

Block 3:

14. [Reserved]

Entity Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Contact Phone Number: (303) 982-6500
Block 4: Recipients of Service	
15 Billed Entities	
<p>List the entity/entities that will be paying the bills directly to the provider for the services requested in this form. These are known as Billed Entities. At least one line of this item must be completed. If a Billed Entity cited on your FCC Form 471 is not listed below, funding may be denied for the funding requests associated with this FCC Form 470. Attach additional pages if needed.</p>	
Entity Number	Entity Name
145710	Jefferson County School District R-1

Entity Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Contact Phone Number: (303) 982-6500

Block 5: Certifications and Signature

I certify that the applicant includes: (Check one or both.)

☒ a schools under the statutory definitions of elementary and secondary schools found in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. §§ 7801 (18) and (38), that do not operate as for-profit businesses, and do not have endowments exceeding \$50 million; and/or

☐ b libraries or library consortia eligible for assistance from a State library administrative agency under the Library Services and Technology Act of 1996 that do not operate as for-profit businesses and whose budgets are completely separate from any schools (including, but not limited to elementary and secondary schools, colleges, and universities).

[Reserved]

☒ I certify that I will post any applicable FCC Form 470 and (if applicable) make any applicable RFP available for at least 28 days before considering all bids received and selecting a service provider. I certify that all bids submitted will be carefully considered and the bid selected will be for the most cost-effective service or equipment offering, with price being the primary factor, and will be the most cost-effective means of meeting educational needs and technology goals.

☒ I certify that I will retain required documents for a period of at least 10 years after the last day of service delivered (or whatever retention period is required by the rules in effect at the time of this certification). I certify that I will retain all documents necessary to demonstrate compliance with the statute and Commission rules regarding the form for, receipt of, and delivery of services receiving schools and libraries discounts. I acknowledge that I may be audited pursuant to participation in the schools and libraries program.

☒ I certify that the services the applicant purchases at discounts provided by 47 U.S.C. § 254 will be used primarily for educational purposes, see 47 C.F.R. § 54.500, and will not be sold, resold or transferred in consideration for money or any other thing of value, except as permitted by the Commission's rules at 47 C.F.R. § 54.513. Additionally, I certify that the entity or entities listed on this form have not received anything of value or a promise of anything of value, other than services and equipment sought by means of this form, from the service provider, or any representative or agent thereof or any consultant in connection with this request for services.

☒ I acknowledge that support under this support mechanism is conditional upon the school(s) and/or library(ies) I represent securing access, separately or through this program, to all of the resources, including computers, training, software, internal connections, maintenance, and electrical capacity necessary to use the services purchased effectively. I recognize that some of the aforementioned resources are not eligible for support. I certify that I have considered what financial resources should be available to cover these costs.

☒ I certify that I am authorized to procure eligible services for the eligible entity(ies). I certify that I am authorized to submit this request on behalf of the eligible entity(ies) listed on this form, that I have examined this request, and to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, all statements of fact contained herein are true.

☒ I certify that I have reviewed all applicable FCC, state, and local procurement/competitive bidding requirements and that I have complied with them. I acknowledge that persons willfully making false statements on this form may be punished by fine or forfeiture, under the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. §§ 502, 503(b), or fine or imprisonment under Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

☒ I acknowledge that FCC rules provide that persons who have been convicted of criminal violations or held civilly liable for certain acts arising from their participation in the schools and libraries support mechanism are subject to suspension and debarment from the program.

Entity Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Contact Phone Number: (303) 982-6500

25 Signature of authorized person: ☐26 Date: 

27a Printed name of authorized person:

Brett Miller

27b Title or position of authorized person:

Chief Information Officer

☐ Check here if the consultant in Item 7 is the Authorized Person.

27c Street Address, P.O. Box, Route Number, City, State, Zip Code:

1829 Denver West Drive
Bldg # 27

City: Golden

State: CO

Zip Code: 80401

27d Telephone Number of Authorized Person:

(303) 982-2265

27e Fax Number of Authorized Person:

(303) 982-6851

27f E-mail Address of Authorized Person:

bmiller@jeffco.k12.co.us

Re-enter E-mail Address:

bmiller@jeffco.k12.co.us

27g Name of Authorized Person's Employer:

Jefferson County Public Schools

Service provider involvement with preparation or certification of an FCC Form 470 can taint the competitive bidding process and result in the denial of funding requests. For more information, refer to the Schools and Libraries area of the USAC web site at www.usac.org/si or call the SLD Client Service Bureau at 1-888-203-8100.

Exhibit 5

Entity Number: 145710	Applicant's Form Identifier: 470/15-16/WAN Bandwidth
Contact Person: Martin Visnak	Phone Number: (303) 982-6500

NOTICE: In accordance with Section 54.504 of the Federal Communications Commission's rules, certain schools and libraries ordering services that are eligible for and seeking universal service discounts must file this Description of Services Requested and Certification Form (FCC Form 470) with the Universal Service Administrator. 47 C.F.R. § 54.503. Collection of information stems from the Commission's authority under Section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended. 47 U.S.C. § 254. The data in the form may be used to ensure that schools and libraries comply with the competitive bidding requirement contained in 47 C.F.R. § 54.503. Schools and libraries must file this form themselves or as part of a consortium.

If an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

The FCC is authorized under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to collect the information we request in this form. We will use the information you provide to determine whether approving this application is in the public interest. If we believe there may be a violation or a potential violation of any applicable statute, regulation, rule or order, your application may be referred to the Federal, state, or local agency responsible for investigating, prosecuting, enforcing, or implementing the statute, rule, regulation or order. In certain cases, the information in your application may be disclosed to the Department of Justice or a court or adjudicative body when (a) the FCC; or (b) any employee of the FCC; or (c) the United States Government is a party of a proceeding before the body or has an interest in the proceeding. In addition, information provided in or submitted with this form or in response to subsequent inquiries may also be subject to disclosure consistent with the Communications Act of 1934, FCC regulations, the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552, or other applicable law.

If you owe a past due debt to the federal government, the information you provide may also be disclosed to the Department of the Treasury Financial Management Service, other federal agencies and/or your employer to offset your salary, IRS tax refund or other payments to collect that debt. The FCC may also provide the information to these agencies through the matching of computer records when authorized.

If you do not provide the information we request on the form, the FCC may delay processing of your application or may return your form without action.

The foregoing Notice is required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. No. 104-13, 44 U.S.C. § 3501, *et seq.*

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 3 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, completing, and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the reporting burden to the Federal Communications Commission, Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Washington, DC 20554.

FCC Form 470
October 2014

Exhibit 5

RFP 23612 eRate WAN Bandwidth for 154
District Sites

	Affiniti	CenturyLink	Comcast	Educational Network	Unite Private Networks
Written Response Evaluation (Team Total of 500 points)	224.725	408.125	214.75	366.75	278
Team Member A	64.475	98.25	48.75	81.25	64
Team Member B	25	56	27.5	92.5	37
Team Member C	45.5	81.25	43.75	62	46
Team Member D	61.75	88.125	61.75	75.25	76.5
Team Member E	28	84.5	33	55.75	54.5
Average Score - Total points/# scores	44.95	81.63	42.95	73.35	55.60
Percentage of Total Available Points	0.45	0.82	0.43	0.73	0.56

Windstream
275.125
54.5
35
56.875
68.25
60.5
55.03
0.55

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

A

Vendor: Affiniti

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.55	2	5.1
Methodology and integration/migration	2.5	5	12.5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.5	8	20
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2.5	5	12.5
References	3	2.5	7.5
Response to architecture requirements	2.75	2.5	6.875
			64.475

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Unknown entity

Expertise not demonstrated

RFP 23610 eRate - DS-3 Carrier
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3.75	2	7.5
Methodology and integration/migration	4	5	20
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	4	8	32
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	4	5	20
References	3.75	2.5	9.375
Response to architecture requirements	3.75	2.5	9.375
Proposal worth 100 points			98.25

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Proven Vendor

Solid Track Record

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Comcast

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.5	2	5
Methodology and integration/migration	2.75	5	13.75
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.5	8	20
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	0	5	0
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			48.75

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Expertise in service delivery is sub par

Doesn't deliver on promises

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Educational Network of America

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3.5	2	7
Methodology and integration/migration	3	5	15
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3.5	8	28
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	3.5	2.5	8.75
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			81.25

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Great Plan

Approach needs further exploration

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Unite Private Networks

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2	2	4
Methodology and integration/migration	2.5	5	12.5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.5	8	20
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	2.5	2.5	6.25
Response to architecture requirements	2.5	2.5	6.25
			64

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Hard to follow/match requirements of RFP

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Windstream

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.5	2	5
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2.2	5	11
References	2.5	2.5	6.25
Response to architecture requirements	2.5	2.5	6.25
			54.5

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Doesn't include Taxes? - District is liable for all taxes??

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Affiniti

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	1	8	8
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	1	5	5
References	1	2.5	2.5
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			25

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

5 year pricing only

cost to upgrde copper atg Windy Peaks & Mt. Evans?
good reference information but not to the size or scope of Jeffco

**RFP 23610 eRate - DS-3 Carrier
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3	8	24
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			56

I don't think it was include

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below
would have liked more detail on references

d??

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule		2	0
Methodology and integration/migration		5	0
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services		8	0
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects		5	0
References		2.5	0
Response to architecture requirements		2.5	0
			0

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Comcast

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	1	8	8
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	1	5	5
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			27.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below
 comcast installed network edge equipment; (status of what we have??)

very hard to follow

Not a lot of detail on Jeffco implementation plan

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Educational Network of America

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	4	2	8
Methodology and integration/migration	4	5	20
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	4	8	32
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	4	2.5	10
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			92.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

references equal to size of Jeffco

Impressive and thoughtful response to all questions.

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Unite Private Networks

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2	2	4
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	1	8	8
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	3	2.5	7.5
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			37

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Confusing pricing schedule

hard to follow since the RFP was in the back of the book and did not acknowledge requests
pricing was not as per RFP

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Windstream

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2	2	4
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects		5	0
References	1	2.5	2.5
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			35

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Affiniti

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	1	5	5
References	3	2.5	7.5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			45.5

All I know of this company

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

There responses were mostly that they read, understand and will comply. No examples of anything

They didn't really provide any project plan. Just said they understand and did not provide any timeframes. Not impressed
They don't provide annual reports
They use Comcast whom I've scored low
They provide 30 day notice for network maintenance

is they are solution for rural sites.

**RFP 23610 eRate - DS-3 Carrier
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	4	5	20
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3	8	24
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3.75	5	18.75
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			81.25

We wouldn't have to integ

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

References were 2 libraries and 1 school

Still can't provide more than T1s to ODLs

They only provided pricing and detail for locations that need upgraded from our existing MoE solutions

Can only get 200MB to Confier HS

rate/migrate much at all

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule		2	0
Methodology and integration/migration		5	0
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services		8	0
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects		5	0
References		2.5	0
Response to architecture requirements		2.5	0
			0

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.25	8	18
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	0.5	5	2.5
References	2.5	2.5	6.25
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			43.75

gave higher rate for 100M

due to past experiences, I

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

They have WAY too many exceptions to the RFP

They were unable to deliver services to us in a timely manor before which lead us to terminate the contract
They did not provide any timefreames and not much of a project plan at all. Not impressed
Provided references for 3 educational facilities but didn't bother listing what they did for these sites.
They say they can provide 100MB to ODLs
Didn't break out Charters in pricing

B to ODLs

can't even give them a 1

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Educational Network of America

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.75	2	5.5
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3	8	24
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			62

didn't give a 3 because th

scored average because I

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

They responded with the best project plan but they did not pay attention to the dates in the RFP.

We need more than 48 hours notification for any standard maintenance downtime - page V.250

Will they hold exception the fact that not all MDFs are always secured? Some are in people's offices and doors are not always locked

Does their monitoring tool provide us the ability to create utilization reports? If so, how far back is that data kept? If not, will they provide SNMP strings

Do they require a dedicated rack for their equipment? If so, will they install those racks and can it be determined on a site by site basis as there are MDI

They provided references for 3 schools districts.

Target response time to critical issues is 2 hours. I think we would want something a bit faster. 2 hours is 1/4 of a school day.

They use only Cisco gear which is a plus

e dates didn't jive with RFP dates

I know nothing about the company or it's employees but they provided a lot of detail about the staff they hire

so we can get this info via Solarwinds?

Es that do not have enough room for dedicated racks.

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Unite Private Networks

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.75	2	5.5
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	1	8	8
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	4	2.5	10
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			46

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Provided a sample timeline which was nice even though a sample. Provided detail on Phases of the project

Although I know nothing a

Provided 10 educational references 4 of which are in CO and provided excellent detail of the projects they completed. Also provided case studies
Their graphical network map didn't show any type of redundancy for the schools
Liked their sample building entry documentation
They didn't provide direct responses to the RFP so it was harder to find info regarding architecture requirements, integration/migration
They didn't say what type of equipment, no mention of QoS, etc. They failed on providing any real detail at all

bout this company, the detail of references made higher score.

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Windstream

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3	8	24
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	1	5	5
References	1.75	2.5	4.375
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			56.875

I don't know this company

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Didn't name the schools in the pricing section which was really strange. Only has the city and address.

They didn't break out the Charter schools

Doesn't look like they provided any solution to ODLs but I didn't look up addresses since they didn't provide names

They didn't provide what type of work they did for the references provided.

' nor do I know anything about their engineers

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Affiniti

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.75	2	5.5
Methodology and integration/migration	2.75	5	13.75
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.5	8	20
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			61.75

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Affinity is Eaglenet, poor experience with Eaglenet in the past. Affinity provided no response to the local power filtering request for how they were to comply, they simply answered will comply. Will they use their own UPS or...? They listed no objection to the "problem" sites. Windy peak and Mt. Evans to be serviced by 10 Mbps copper initially. References are not anywhere close to our size or configuration. They say they will / can use WinBill! \$2,600/month for the labs!!! \$1K or \$3K one time build fee (depends on option) per site! Did not see quotes for the stadiums in their price list. Affinity peers with Comcast.

**RFP 23610 eRate - DS-3 Carrier
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3.5	2	7
Methodology and integration/migration	3.75	5	18.75
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3.5	8	28
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3.75	5	18.75
References	3	2.5	7.5
Response to architecture requirements	3.25	2.5	8.125
			88.125

Proposal worth 100 points

***Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)**

Excellent = 4

Above Average = 3

Average = 2

Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

References were not to our scale but CTL currently supports the District so they clearly can be enterprise level support. Labs would be T-1 or N-T1s, 100 Mbps, els and 200Mbps HS/MS Metro Ethernet, Geomax as an option but point to point circuits and 2 per school required. CenturyLink would certainly be the easiest to switch to. Cost for 10Gb circuits to Quail and Ed Center will be roughly the same as they are presently but we will have 3X the bandwidth. Preschools will come up to 100Mbps on MOE. RFP well written and composed. NAC and 500 Kipling now in service are (we will need conduit). Elk creek and Coal creek get 100 Mbps MOE. Mountain DS-3 carrier schools changed to MOE.

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule		2	0
Methodology and integration/migration		5	0
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services		8	0
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects		5	0
References		2.5	0
Response to architecture requirements		2.5	0
			0

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Comcast

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	2.5	5	12.5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.75	8	22
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	2.5	2.5	6.25
			61.75

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Comcast has a dismal service record with the District, it is interesting they titled their response B4B instead of Comcast, was this masking? Their response is for copper of fiber delivery. References are not the same size and structure as the District. \$2600 for labs at 100mbps. Monitoring, NOC, escalation and "support" all look fine on paper and they offer 4-nines 99.99% availability. We have had a very dismal circuit delivery experience with Comcast. Their Customer service can literally drop off the map with days, weeks, months going by without contact. I would be concerned as to them being able to meet delivery times.

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Educational Network of America

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3.5	2	7
Methodology and integration/migration	3	5	15
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.75	8	22
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	3.5	2.5	8.75
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			75.25

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

ENA had a well presented response. The references given were of the same size and scope as our District. Managed services is a different thought process for bandwidth. This will be slightly different to compare to the other respondents as ENA will manage all end devices as part of the service agreement. Roughly the same price as others with their 60 month contract however Ed Ctr and Quail as well as mountain schools are very expensive. They list many options such as hand sets etc. that we would not use. To some degree they gave us boilerplate in the pricing we need to make sure we are not missing anything that would significantly increase costs. I was unsure what the cost was to "incrementally increase" bandwidth at the schools and what the increment was (page 77). \$1500 for "incremental increase up to 1GB"

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Unite Private Networks

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.75	2	5.5
Methodology and integration/migration	3	5	15
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3.25	8	26
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3.25	5	16.25
References	2.75	2.5	6.875
Response to architecture requirements	2.75	2.5	6.875
			76.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Unite proposes pulling new, dedicated fiber to all district locations for use by the District exclusively. They included SFPs for each hand-off. Prices listed assumed a 58% e-Rate discount applied. Proposed hub and spoke home runs to ed ctr from all schools. Saw no mention of the DR center. In order for us to have both sites provisioned with their plan we would need a junction or both Quail and Ed Ctr as hubs with 2 pair of fiber to each site. That would effectively double the cost. All fiber appears to be overhead. +/- \$54M company



RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Windstream

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	2.5	2	5
Methodology and integration/migration	2.75	5	13.75
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.75	8	22
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2.75	5	13.75
References	2.5	2.5	6.25
Response to architecture requirements	3	2.5	7.5
			68.25

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Plus/minus \$280M net company. References are much smaller schools/districts. One sales rep and 5 techs for Denver metro area. Many sites are \$10K/month! Ed and Quail about same price as other respondents. It is assumed they will bring new plant to our sites but it is not defined whether or not the fiber is Windstream's or 3rd party fiber. Little detail is given as to how they will implement this large task. No detail on how they plan to use/architect the last mile into each building.

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Affiniti

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	0	2	0
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	1	8	8
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	1.5	5	7.5
References	1	2.5	2.5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			28

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Weakness

Strength

Only pricing provided was for 5 year term.

Logo looks like a minion ;)

**RFP 23610 eRate - DS-3 Carrier
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3.5	2	7
Methodology and integration/migration	4	5	20
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	3.75	8	30
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3.5	5	17.5
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			84.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Weaknesses

Strengths

Would have like to have seen pricing for all sites.

Already in all locations

**RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One**

Vendor: Century Link

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule		2	0
Methodology and integration/migration		5	0
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services		8	0
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects		5	0
References		2.5	0
Response to architecture requirements		2.5	0
			0

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Comcast

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	1	2	2
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	0.5	5	2.5
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			33

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Weaknesses

Did not follow requested format.

Past experience in dealing with this vendor for other network projects.

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Educational Network of America

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2	5	10
References	3.5	2.5	8.75
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			55.75

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Unite Private Networks

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	1	5	5
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2	8	16
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	3	5	15
References	4	2.5	10
Response to architecture requirements	1	2.5	2.5
			54.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Weaknesses

Strengths

Extensive use of aerial fiber.

Did not include pricing for switch option, card option, etc.

RFP 23612 eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Proposal Evaluation Form - Stage One

Vendor: Windstream

	A	B	C
	Rating/Points	Weights	Total Weighted Points
Project Plan/Schedule	3	2	6
Methodology and integration/migration	2	5	10
Technical approach o Clarity and reasonableness of proposed method o Ability to meet the requirements and specifications of the District's scope of services	2.75	8	22
Demonstrated expertise in this particular field o Qualifications of personnel to be assigned to the project and ability as a company to complete the solution. o Past experience and demonstrated success on similar projects	2.5	5	12.5
References	2	2.5	5
Response to architecture requirements	2	2.5	5
			60.5

Proposal worth 100 points

*Ratings (you may use .25, .50, .75)
Excellent = 4
Above Average = 3
Average = 2
Below Average = 1

Please note the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal below

Weaknesses

Strengths

PIX Firewalls in their core?

RFP 23612 eRate WAN Bandwidth for 154 District Sites
Stage One – Proposal Strengths and Weaknesses

Affiniti

Pros:

- Good reference information but not to the size or scope of Jeffco
- They provide 30 day notice for network maintenance

Cons:

- Unknown entity
- Expertise not demonstrated
- 5 year pricing only
- What is the cost to upgrade copper at Windy Peaks & Mt. Evans?
- Their responses were mostly that they read, understand and will comply. No examples of anything
- They didn't really provide any project plan. Just said they understand and did not provide any timeframes. Not impressed.
- They don't provide annual reports
- They use Comcast whom I've scored low
- More of a solution for rural areas
- Affiniti is Eaglenet, poor experience with Eaglenet in the past
- Provided not response to the local power filtering request for how they were to comply, they simply answered will comply
- References are not anywhere close to our size or configuration
- \$2,600/month for the labs!!!
- \$1K or \$3K one time build fee (depend on option) per site!
- Did not see quotes for the stadiums in their price list
- Only pricing provided was for 5 year term

CenturyLink

Pros:

- Proven vendor
- Solid track record
- RFP is well written and composes

Cons:

- Would have like more detail on references
- Project plan?
- Still can't provide more than T1s to ODLs
- They only provided pricing and detail for locations that need upgraded from our existing MoE solutions
- Can only get 200MB to Conifer HS
- References were two libraries and one school
- References were not to our scale
- Would have liked to have seen pricing for all sites

Comcast

Pros:

Cons:

- Proposal was very hard to follow
- Not a lot of detail on Jeffco implementation plan
- They have WAY too many exceptions to the RFP
- They did not provide any timeframes and not much of a project plan at all. Not impressed
- Provided references for 3 educational facilities but didn't bother listing what they did for these sites
- Didn't break out Charters in pricing
- References are not the same size and structure as the District
- Monitoring, NOC, escalation and "support" all look fine on paper and they offer 4-nine 99.99% availability – due to past experience I am concerned as to them being able to meet delivery times as their customer service can literally drop off the map with day, weeks, months going by without contact
- Did not follow requested format

Educational Network

Pros:

- Great plan
- References equal to size of Jeffco Schools impressive and thoughtful response to all questions
- They responded with the best project plan but they did not pay attention to the dates in the RFP
- They provided references for three school district
- They use only Cisco gear
- Well-presented response
- References given were of the same size and scope as our District

Cons:

- Approach needs further exploration
- Target response time to critical issues is 2 hours – we would want something faster – 2 hours is ¼ of a school day
- We need more than 48 hours notification for any standard maintenance downtime (page V.250)
- Ed Ctr, Quail and mountain schools are very expensive
- They listed many options such as handsets etc. that we would not use
- To some degree they gave us boilerplate in the pricing.....
- Unsure what the cost was to "incrementally increase" bandwidth at the schools and what the increment was (page 77) \$1500 for "incremental increase up to 1GB"

Unite Private Networks

Pros:

- Provided a sample timeline which was nice even though a sample
- Provided detail on phases of the project
- Provided ten educational references, four of which are in CO and provided excellent detail of the projects they completed. Also provided case studies
- Like their sample building entry documentation

Cons:

- Hard to follow/match requirements of RFP
- Confusing pricing schedule
- Hard to follow since the RFP was in the back of the book and did not acknowledge requests
- Pricing was not as per RFP
- Their graphical network map didn't show any type of redundancy for the schools
- They didn't provide direct responses to the RFP so it was harder to find info regarding architecture requirements, integration/migration
- They didn't say what type of equipment, not mention of QoS, etc.
- They failed on providing any real detail at all
- No mention of the DR center in their proposal
- In order for us to have both sites provisioned with their plan we would need a junction or both Quail and Ed Ctr as hubs with t pair of fiber to each site – that would effectively double the cost!
- Extensive use of aerial fiber
- Did not include pricing for switch option, card option, etc.

Windstream

Pros:

Cons:

- Doesn't include taxes? – District is liable for all taxes??
- Didn't name the schools in the pricing section, which was really strange. Only has the city and address
- They didn't break out the Charter schools
- Doesn't look like they provided any solution to ODLs but I didn't look up addresses since they didn't provide names
- They didn't provide what type of work they did for the references provided
- Many sites are \$10K a month!
- It is assumed they will bring new plant to our sites but it is not defined whether or not the fiber is Windstream's or 3rd party fiber
- Little detail is given as to how they will implement this large task
- No detail on how they plan to use/architect the last mile into each building
- PIX Firewalls in their core?

RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

RFP 23612 – eRate WAN High Bandwidth for 154 District Sites

Thank you for participating on the evaluation committee for this Request for Proposal (RFP). To protect the integrity of this formal solicitation and the evaluation process, it is essential that each participant understand and abide by the following responsibilities. Adherence to these requirements will help assure the effectiveness of the evaluation team as a whole, and protect the overall interests of Jefferson County Schools in the award of this RFP.

1. **Fairness and Integrity.** It is the responsibility of every member on the evaluation panel to collectively ensure that the evaluation is conducted in an impartial, objective and professional manner, and that the same level of effort is extended to the evaluation of all vendors' proposals/presentations.
2. **Understanding of the Project.** Your success as an effective member of the team depends on your comprehensive understanding of the project, and your familiarity with the requirements and specifications contained in the RFP. Familiarize yourself with this document.
3. **Attendance.** Attendance of all committee members at all scheduled evaluation meetings is crucial to the quality of the evaluation process. Without all representatives present, meetings are not effective, as not all opinions can be shared in a group setting. Therefore, committee members must attend all meetings of the committee, including interviews with the proposers, if conducted.
4. **Confidentiality.** To preserve the integrity of the evaluation process, the following rules of confidentiality must be observed:
 - a. Committee members must conduct themselves with complete confidentiality. Confidentiality is both a legal and ethical requirement and is vital to fair, equitable evaluation of the proposals. You must not discuss the contents of the proposals with anyone outside of the committee.
 - b. Committee members must not communicate with proposers about this project outside of any scheduled and sanctioned evaluation activity, without the knowledge and approval of Purchasing. If any member of this evaluation committee has any reason to contact one or more proposers participating in this RFP, even if the matter is not directly or indirectly related to this project, they must divulge the nature and reason of the contact with the firm to Purchasing, who will determine if that activity poses a conflict with the person's participation on this evaluation committee.
5. **Conflicts of Interest.** Per Board Policy GBEA-E, you may not participate as a member of this committee if you hold an interest in any business or undertaking which may be directly and substantially affected to its economic benefit by an official action to be taken by this committee.

Adapted from information posted on NIGP website

<https://www.nigp.org/common/restrict/formsdocsnew/casrfpevalresp.pdf>

Signature _____

Name _____

Date